

RANDER LANE,

 Plaintiff(s),

 v.

 CLARK COUNTY, et al.,

 Defendant(s).

RANDER LANE,

 Plaintiff(s),

 v.

 CLARK COUNTY, et al.,

 Defendant(s).

Presently, before the court is defendant Clark County's motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #28). Plaintiff Randel Lane has filed an opposition (doc. #31) to which defendants have replied (doc. #32).

• • •

1 The vast majority of the “evidence” submitted in support of the motion for summary
2 judgment is unauthenticated. The county has provided numerous letters, records, emails, and
3 doctor’s notes, but no declaration, affidavit, or other evidence sufficient to support a finding that the
4 exhibits are what they claim to be. Furthermore, the county has not identified whether which, if any,
5 of these documents were produced by the plaintiff during discovery. *See Malijack Prods., Inc. v.*
6 *Good-Times Home Video Corp.*, 81 F.3d 881, 889 n.12 (9th Cir. 1996) (documents produced by a
7 party in discovery are deemed authentic when offered by the party-opponent). While plaintiff has
8 failed to object, this court must remain faithful to the rules governing our judicial system, and
9 therefore cannot grant summary judgment on such a deficient record. *See Orr*, 285 F.3d 764 (9th
10 Cir. 2002).

11 Accordingly,

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that defendants’ motion for
13 summary judgment (doc. #29) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.

14 DATED August 6, 2012.

15
16 
17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**